



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,013	05/09/2006	Roland Buhlmann	06268/RPM	4932
1933	7590	08/21/2008	EXAMINER	
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC			KASTLER, SCOTT R	
220 Fifth Avenue				
16TH Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/579,013	BUHLMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott Kastler	1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/9/2006</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the claims should not be referred to in the body of the specification when describing the invention, as occurs at page 1 of the instant specification, for example.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: This claim is informal because the term "are envisaged" (contemplated) at the end of the claim renders the claim potentially unclear as to whether or not the previously recited "means for positioning" are actually required by the claim or are merely an acceptable additional component. For examination purposes the claim was given it's broadest meaning and the "means for positioning" were interpreted as being only an optional component not actually required by the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 3, 8-10 and 12-15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The above claims do not failry further limit the claims from which they depend because all of the limitations recited within the above claims deal with a part which is not actually required by the instant claims (the positioning means which is only envisaged as part of the apparatus).

Means Plus Function Language in the Claims

Instant claim 3 includes language to a “means for positioning” in means-plus function format, however the means is described in the specification, on page 5 for example as including any desired means able to perform the function and therefore has not been accorded means plus function status.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Nehrlich et al or Waltensphul et al. Each of Nehrlich et al and Waltensphul et al teach piston/cylinder arrangements for actuating a sliding closure applied to a vessel containing molten metal once the vessel has been positioned on a ladle rotating tower, as described on page 1 of the instant specification for example, or shown in the figures of each of Nehrlich et al or Waltensphul et al, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims except the use of a manipulating means for positioning the piston/cylinder arrangement. Each of Nehrlich et al and Waltensphul et al teach positioning the piston/cylinder unit manually. It has been well settled that motivation to employ broadly recited automatic or mechanical means to replace operations preformed manually by the prior art would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See MPEP 2144.04 III. In the instant case,

Art Unit: 1793

since each of Nehrlich et al or Waltensphul et al teach positioning the piston/cylinder units of their systems manually, motivation to broadly provide automatic or manual means for performing this function in either of Nehrlich et al or Waltensphul et al, would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Scott Kastler/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

sk